



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,918	01/10/2006	Steindor S. Gudmundsson	3535-0141PUS1	5641
2292 7590 09/05/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
POOMORE, TRAVIS D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4148				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/05/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,918

Applicant(s)

GUDMUNDSSON ET AL.

Examiner

TRAVIS POGMORE

Art Unit

4148

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 62-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 62-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 64-67, 77-79, 81, 89 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10 January 2006, 31 May 2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/563918 filed on January 10, 2006 is presented for examination by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 C.F.R. 1.63.

Priority

3. As required by M.P.E.P. 201.14(c), acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for priority based on applications filed on July 10, 2003.
4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. As required by M.P.E.P. 609, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statement dated January 10, 2006 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending.

Drawings

6. The applicant's drawings submitted are acceptable for examination purposes.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 64-66 and 77 are objected to because of the following informalities: They recite "the limited access area(s)" when no particular limited access area has previously been recited in the claims.
8. Claim 67 and 79 are objected to because of the following informalities: They recite "the transaction log" when no transaction log is present in the claims on which they respectively depend.
9. Claims 78 and 81 are objected to because of the following informalities: They recite "the first storage means" which implies a plurality of storage means when only a single storage means is recited in claim 75 on which they depend.
10. Claim 89 is objected to because of the following informalities: It recites "the evidence storage means" when no evidence storage means is previously recited in the claim. Also, in line 16 there is a period before the end of the claim; periods may not be used in the claims except for abbreviations and at the end of each claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claims 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably enable one skilled in the relevant art to make and use the claimed invention. The claims recite a “computer program product” which is not clearly defined in the specification, and thus the scope of the claims is not ascertainable by reference to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter of software, *per se* (a “computer program product” which is lacking definition in the specification and thus under the broadest reasonable interpretation comprises software). The claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor is it a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. It is at best, function descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are non-statutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive

material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming non-functional descriptive material, i.e. abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

Claims 91 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory for at least the reason stated above. Claims 91 and 92 are dependent upon claim 90; however, they do not add any feature or subject matter that would solve any of the non-statutory deficiencies of claim 90.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 62, 66, 68-71, 73-75, 83-85, and 87-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,398,708 (hereinafter "Goldman et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,282,620 (hereinafter "Keese").

As to claim 62, Goldman et al. teaches a method of obtaining security and audit ability in a system, the method comprising the steps of:

- generating a random number by means of a random number generator (column 18, line 61 to column 19, line 3, the validation code),

- providing a sequence number for each of the random numbers generated so as to create a random number - sequence number pair (column 18, lines 37-41 and column 19, lines 22-25, the internal sequence number which, when combined with the validation code, produces the "sync" number),

- storing the created random number - sequence number pair in a storage means (column 19, lines 52-59 and Fig. 7, reference 91),

the method further comprising the step of, at a chosen time, verifying stored random number - sequence number pairs, so as to ensure that every stored random number - sequence number pair is an authentic random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 49-67), but does not specifically teach its use in an on-line system.

However, Keesee teaches that using a computer system (and more specifically a lottery system) on-line is well known and expected in the art (column 1, lines 17-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. to use the computer system on-line as indicated in Keesee (instead of just locally) in order to allow a broader application of the secure and auditable system.

As to claim 66, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the limited access area further comprises a prize table. (column 18, lines 45-49).

As to claim 68, Goldman et al. teaches further comprising the step of issuing a ticket comprising information relating to the sequence number (column 16, line 67 to column 17, line 6 and column 19, lines 14-21, the "Inventory Serial Number" provides information relating to the sequence number).

As to claim 69, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the on-line system is a lottery, and the issued ticket is a lottery ticket (Abstract, lines 1-5).

As to claim 70, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the ticket further comprises information relating to a winning/no winning category of the ticket (column 19, lines 22-30).

As to claim 71, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the step of issuing a ticket is based upon the random number and a probability table (column 10, lines 6-15 and 25-43, the overall closed pool of lottery numbers is the probability table with each of them possessing equal odds of being chosen, the "parameter look-up table" that defines the desired distribution of winners ensures appropriate probability of any given number being a winning number), the method further comprising the step of updating the

probability table in response to the issued ticket, so as to maintain an at least substantially fixed winning/no winning ratio (column 10, lines 43-48).

As to claim 73, Goldman et al. teaches further comprising the step of alerting an operator in case the verifying step results in the discovery of one or more non-authentic random number - sequence number pairs (column 19, line 44 to column 20, line 2, the output validation report serves to alert an operator).

As to claim 74, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the verifying step comprises the steps of:

- checking whether a given random number - sequence number pair has previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, lines 59-62),
 - marking said given random number - sequence number pair as a true pair in case it has previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, lines 62-67, having reversed the randomizing process and checked the "sync" number (i.e. random number – sequence number pair) against the reference-file (i.e. storage means) the validation program is able to determine whether the provided number is valid, which is to say it must be in the reference-file and possess valid game data), and
- alerting an operator in case the given random number - sequence number pair has not previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, line 67 to column 20, line 2, the output validation report serves to alert an operator).

As to claim 75, Goldman et al. teaches a secure and auditable system comprising:

a random number generator (column 18, line 61 to column 19, line 3, the validation code),

means for providing a sequence number for each generated random number, so as to create a random number - sequence number pair (column 18, lines 37-41 and column 19, lines 22-25, the internal sequence number which, when combined with the validation code, produces the "sync" number),

storage means for storing the created random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 52-59 and Fig. 7, reference 91),

verifying means for verifying, at a chosen time, stored random number - sequence number pairs against a transaction created in the online system, so as to ensure that every stored random number - sequence number pair is an authentic random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 49-67), but does not specifically teach an online system.

However, Keesee teaches that an on-line system (and more specifically an on-line lottery system) is well known and expected in the art (column 1, lines 17-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. to use the system on-line as indicated in Keesee to obtain security and audit ability for an on-line system.

As to claim 83, Goldman et al. teaches further comprising means for issuing a ticket comprising information relating to the sequence number (column 16, line 67 to column 17, line 6 and column 19, lines 14-21, the "Inventory Serial Number" provides information relating to the sequence number).

As to claim 84, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the on-line system is a lottery, and the issued ticket is a lottery ticket (Abstract, lines 1-5).

As to claim 85, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the ticket is issued based upon the random number and a probability table (column 10, lines 25-43), the on-line system further comprising means for updating the probability table in response to the issued ticket, so as to maintain an at least substantially fixed winning/no winning ratio (column 10, lines 43-48).

As to claim 87, Goldman et al. teaches further comprising means for alerting an operator and an auditor in case the verification results in the discovery of one or more non- authentic random number - sequence number pairs (column 19, line 44 to column 20, line 2, the output validation report serves to alert an operator).

As to claim 88, Goldman et al. teaches wherein the verifying means further comprises:

- means for checking whether a given random number - sequence number pair has previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, lines 59-62),

- means for marking said given random number - sequence number pair as a true pair in case it has previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, lines 62-67, having reversed the randomizing process and checked the "sync" number (i.e. random number – sequence number pair) against the reference-file (i.e. storage means) the validation program is able to determine whether the provided number is valid, which is to say it must be in the reference-file and possess valid game data), and

- means for alerting an operator in case the given random number - sequence number pair has not previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, line 67 to column 20, line 2, the output validation report serves to alert an operator).

As to claim 89, Goldman et al. teaches a device for providing security and audit ability in a system, the device comprising:

- a random number generator (column 18, line 61 to column 19, line 3, the validation code),

- means for providing a sequence number for each generated random number, so as to create a random number - sequence number pair (column 18, lines 37-41 and column 19, lines 22-25, the internal sequence number which, when combined with the validation code, produces the "sync" number),

- storage means for storing the created random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 52-59 and Fig. 7, reference 91),

- verifying means for verifying, at a chosen time, stored random number - sequence number pairs against a transaction created in the online system, so as to ensure that every stored random number - sequence number pair is an authentic random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 49-67),

the verifying means further comprising:

- means for checking whether a given random number - sequence number pair has previously been stored in the storage means (column 19, lines 59-67),

- means for marking said given random number - sequence number pair in the online system as a true pair in case it has previously been verified against the random number - sequence number pair in the evidence storage means (column 19, line 67 to column 20, line 2),

- means for alerting an operator in case the given random number - sequence number pair has not previously been verified, wherein the storage means and the random number generator have limited access (column 19, line 67 to column 20, line 2, the output validation report serves to alert an operator), but does not specifically teach an online system.

However, Keesee teaches that an on-line system (and more specifically an on-line lottery system) is well known and expected in the art (column 1, lines 17-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. to use the system on-line as indicated in Keesee to obtain security and audit ability for an on-line system.

As to claim 90, Goldman et al. teaches a computer program product for obtaining security and audit ability in a system (Fig. 7, column 5, lines 46-47, and column 18, lines 23-31), the program being adapted to:

- generate a random number by means of a random number generator (column 18, line 61 to column 19, line 3, the validation code),

- provide a sequence number for each of the random numbers generated so as to create a random number - sequence number pair (column 18, lines 37-41 and column 19, lines 22-25, the internal sequence number which, when combined with the validation code, produces the "sync" number),

- store the created random number - sequence number pair in a first storage means (column 19, lines 52-59 and Fig. 7, reference 91),

the program further being adapted to verify stored random number - sequence number pairs, so as to ensure that every stored random number - sequence number pair is an authentic random number - sequence number pair (column 19, lines 49-67), but does not specifically teach an online system.

However, Keesee teaches that an on-line system (and more specifically an on-line lottery system) is well known and expected in the art (column 1, lines 17-18).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. to use the system on-line as indicated in Keesee to obtain security and audit ability for an on-line system.

17. Claims 63-64 and 76-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman et al. in view of Keesee and further in view of WIPO Patent App. Pub. No. WO 98/40140 (hereinafter "Muir").

As to claim 63, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach a method according to claim 62, but do not specifically teach wherein the storing step is performed by storing the random number - sequence number pair in a storage means with limited access.

However, Muir teaches wherein the storing step is performed by storing the random number - sequence number pair in a storage means with limited access (page 1, lines 17-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. and Keesee to allow only limited access to the storage means as indicated in Muir to increase physical security for the on-line system.

As to claim 64, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach a method according to claim 62, but do not specifically teach wherein access to the limited access area(s) can only be obtained by one or more authorised persons.

However, Muir teaches wherein access to the limited access area(s) can only be obtained by one or more authorised persons (page 1, lines 22-31, where an authorised person is someone possessing a key to a physical lock and/or a government inspector).

As to claim 76, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the storage means has limited access.

However, Muir teaches wherein the storage means has limited access (page 1, lines 17-21).

As to claim 77, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein access to the limited access area(s) can only be obtained by one or more authorised persons.

However, Muir teaches wherein access to the limited access area(s) can only be obtained by one or more authorised persons (page 1, lines 22-31, where an authorised person is someone possessing a key to a physical lock and/or a government inspector).

18. Claims 65, 67, 78-82 and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman et al. in view of Keesee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,447,251 (hereinafter "Szrek et al.").

As to claim 65, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach a method according to claim 62, but do not specifically teach wherein the limited access area further generates a transaction log comprising:

- a timestamp,
- a game-id,

- a customer-id,
- a sequence number, and
- a random number,

wherein the transaction log is stored in a second limited access area.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the limited access area further generates a transaction log (column 4, lines 9-13) comprising:

- a timestamp (column 4, lines 13-16),
- a game-id (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62, the game-id in particular being anticipated in Goldman et al., column 6, lines 30-35 and 47-50),
- a customer-id (column 4, lines 13-16 and 37-40, the personal computers or other processors are identified by digital signatures (i.e. customer-ids)),
- a sequence number (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62), and
- a random number (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62),

wherein the transaction log is stored in a second limited access area (column 4, lines 49-54 and column 7, lines 45-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. and Keesee to use a transaction log as part of the limited access area indicated in Szrek et

al. to increase audit ability for the on-line system, in particular adding the ability to track the verifications and access of the first limited access area in a separate secure area.

As to claim 67, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach a method according to claim 62, but do not specifically teach wherein the transaction log is used to audit transactions in an online system by one or more audit processes performed by audit processing means.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the transaction log is used to audit transactions in an online system by one or more audit processes performed by audit processing means (column 4, lines 23-33).

As to claim 78, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the first storage means further comprises means for generating a transaction log and a get list.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the first storage means further comprises means for generating a transaction log and a get list (column 4, lines 9-16).

As to claim 79, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the transaction log is stored in a second storage means.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the transaction log is stored in a second storage means (column 7, lines 45-57).

As to claim 80, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the data stored in the first storage means is used to audit transactions in a online system by an audit processing means.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the data stored in the first storage means is used to audit transactions in a online system by an audit processing means (column 4, lines 23-33).

As to claim 81, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the data stored in the second storage means can be used to audit transactions in a online system by an audit processing means.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the data stored in the second storage means can be used to audit transactions in a online system by an audit processing means (column 7, lines 45-57).

As to claim 82, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the first storage means, second storage means and the audit processing means are concealed in a certification zone.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the first storage means, second storage means and the audit processing means are concealed in a certification zone (column 6,

line 67 to column 7, line 29, all of the processors communicate with encryption, which inherently requires authorization to decrypt).

As to claim 91, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach the computer program product of claim 90, but do not specifically teach wherein a transaction log is generated (column 4, lines 9-13), the transaction log comprising:

- a timestamp,
- a game-id,
- a customer-id,
- a sequence number, and
- a random number,

wherein the transaction log is stored in a second limited access area.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein a transaction log is generated, the transaction log comprising:

- a timestamp (column 4, lines 13-16),
- a game-id (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62, the game-id in particular being anticipated in Goldman et al., column 6, lines 30-35 and 47-50),
- a customer-id (column 4, lines 13-16 and 37-40, the personal computers or other processors are identified by digital signatures (i.e. customer-ids)),
- a sequence number (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62), and

- a random number (column 4, lines 13-16, where the actual event that was generated is the method of claim 62),

wherein the transaction log is stored in a second limited access area (column 4, lines 49-54).

As to claim 92, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach the computer program product of claim 90, but do not specifically teach wherein the online generated information in a first storage means and a second storage means is used to audit transactions in the online system by one or more audit processes performed by an audit processing means.

However, Szrek et al. teaches wherein the online generated information in a first storage means and a second storage means is used to audit transactions in the online system by one or more audit processes performed by an audit processing means (column 7, lines 45-57).

19. Claims 72 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman et al. in view of Keesee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,351,982 (hereinafter "Miller et al.").

As to claim 72, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach a method for an on-line system according to claim 62, but do not specifically teach wherein the on-line system is an encryption system.

However, Miller et al. teaches using a secure on-line system for encryption (column 4, lines 23-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. and Keesee to use the secure and auditable on-line system as an encryption/key generation system as indicated in Miller et al. since it is a standard way to provide a trusted key repository/verification system that is still easily accessible.

As to claim 86, Goldman et al. and Keesee teach an on-line system according to claim 75, but do not specifically teach wherein the on-line system is an encryption system.

However, Miller et al. teaches using a secure on-line system for encryption (column 4, lines 23-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Goldman et al. and Keesee to use the secure and auditable on-line system as an encryption/key generation system as indicated in Miller et al. since it is a standard way to provide a trusted key repository/verification system that is still easily accessible.

Conclusion

20. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the applicant's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See MPEP 707.05(c).

U.S. Patent No. 5,158,293 (Mullins)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRAVIS POGMORE whose telephone number is (571)270-7313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday between 7:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Pham can be reached on 571-272-3689. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,918
Art Unit: 4148

Page 23

/Thomas K Pham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4148

/T. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 4148